

pre processing the resume to determine a resume type based on the determined language, origin, layout and topology of the resume;
selecting a template based on the determined type of resume and inputting the template into memory, said template having a discreet number of layouts, topologies and categories and sets or series of sections of text information for each category;
means for selecting a default template when the resume type cannot be determined to allow the system to extract the most important information on the resume allowing an automated contact generation and response to the resume originator;
automatically transferring each normalized resume content to a data section within a discreet data store such as a database or a tagged data store such as XML in which each said resume data section is identified by a storage section identifier such as a fieldname or a tag-name mapped to the normalized resume content;
an automated resume response mechanism to be either electronic or paper based

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow:

Status of Claims

Claim 1 has been amended, new claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13 have been added and claims 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-13 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11 and 12 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,939 ("De Hilster") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529 ("Lakritz").
Claims 6-7, 10 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,939 ("De Hilster") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529 ("Lakritz") and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,712 ("DuFresne").
Claims 8-9 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,939 ("De Hilster") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529 ("Lakritz") and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,712 ("DuFresne") and U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,480 ("Donohue").
Claims 1-3, 10-12 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,605,120 ("Fields") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,700 ("Larsen").

Claims 4-5 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,605,120 ("Fields") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,700 ("Larsen") and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529 ("Lakritz").

Claims 6-7 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,605,120 ("Fields") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,700 ("Larsen") and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,712 ("DuFresne").

Claims 8-9 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,605,120 ("Fields") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,700 ("Larsen") and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,712 ("DuFresne") and U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,480 ("Donohue"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, insofar as they may be applied to the pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

The independent claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 recite a method (or system or software) that automatically pre processes a resume using lexical and content analysis to determine the origin, language and type of resume, which then determines the selection of an appropriate template to use, where the template is an intelligent description of discreet sets of layouts and topologies of said resume as well as sets of categories and sets or series of sections of text information for each category. The processing assumes no prior knowledge of the "alien" document (resume) further there is also no prior knowledge of the origin or language of the resume, which itself cannot be assumed to be generated in a computer system. This makes processing intelligence very different based on the fact that it is entirely relying on syntactical and contents analysis for any conclusions and determinations concerning the resume both regarding language, origin as well as layout and topology and the presence or not of different types of document sections and section categories. Accordingly, the claimed invention provides efficient resume processing that takes advantage of unique intelligence provided by the syntactical and contents analysis as well as the layout and topology analysis. At least these claimed features are not taught or suggested by prior art.

The claims 8-9, 12-13 recite a method (or system or software) that based on mechanism of default templates, themselves intelligent descriptions of different fundamental language structures and language dependent lexical definitions and descriptions, that provide a "fall-back" processing mechanism were the pre processing system fails to determine the resume type. As with other claims the processing cannot assume any prior knowledge of the "alien" document (resume) further there is also no prior knowledge of the origin or language of the resume, which itself cannot be assumed to be generated in a computer system. At least these claimed features are not taught or suggested by prior art.

Specifically, *De Hilster* focuses on the unstructured text to data transformation and especially on a feedback loop where the author of the document goes back and manually corrects and modifies the submitted document. *Larsen* is concerned using data stored in a database to automatically fill out data fields of multiple forms and is really the opposite of the claimed invention. *Lakritz* is concerned allowing multi-lingual web presentations, the opposite of the claimed invention, of multi-lingual data

stored in a controlled database and data storage, where language detection is mainly based on manual user input or browser or system settings such as origin of the browsers IP address. Neither of these references (nor their reasonable combination) discloses or suggests relying on syntactical and contents analysis for any conclusions and d terminations concerning the resume both regarding language, origin as well as layout and topology and the presence or not of different types of document sections and section categories, when processing an incoming "alien" document where the system has no prior knowledge of the layout, topology or origin and language of the resume.

Fields focuses on extracting web content from a web page, which is a highly structured document type with pre-defined TAGS (labels) for each section and or paragraph. Further a web page is stored and managed on a computer server which adds to the predictability and pre-determination of the environment and the types of information stored. The filter defined by *Fields* is used to present an original web page transformed into another web page presentation, hence is more the opposite of the claimed invention too.

DuFresne focuses on defining HTML extension TAGS for implementing a dynamic web environment for displaying of web pages to web users. The data to be presented is stored in a database directly or indirectly controlled by the system. The focus is on the maintenance and deployment systems and methods in hypertext environment, which is a TAGGED format.

Donohue focuses on displaying dynamic web pages to a web user, the data comes from a data source (storage) on a server and this data is structured with a hierarchical relationship.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional features which are also patentable when considered as a whole.

For example, claim 7 – 9 recites using a default template for each language. Claim 8 recites that the default template includes alternative lexical and language structures, layouts, topologies and keywords of a group to associate a resume content with the category associated with the group. These recited features are also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favourable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under F.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account.

Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to MagnaWare Inc. If any extension of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _____ By _____
MagnaWare Inc. Joakim F. Peleus
Telephone: 831 469 3425 x1010 Applicant